

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

|                               |   |   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>STANLEY SHEPPARD,</b>      | ) |   |
|                               | ) |   |
| <b>Plaintiff,</b>             | ) |   |
|                               | ) |   |
| <b>v.</b>                     | ) | <b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:19-CV-336 (MTT)</b> |
|                               | ) |   |
| <b>ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE,</b> | ) |   |
|                               | ) |   |
| <b>Defendant.</b>             | ) |   |
|                               | ) |   |

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Stanley Sheppard moves the Court for reconsideration of its Order (Doc. 11) and Judgment (Doc. 12) dismissing his second amended complaint.<sup>1</sup> Doc. 13.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. Indeed, “reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806 at \*1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Id.* “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate his prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

---

<sup>1</sup> Sheppard has also appealed the Court’s Order and Judgment. Docs. 14; 16.

Sheppard provides no argument as to why reconsideration is warranted. Doc. 13. Rather, Sheppard's motion is merely a cut and paste of certain pages of his second amended complaint. *Compare* Doc. 13 *with* Doc. 10 at 8, 14, 17. And those pages are statements of the alleged facts that the Court already considered in dismissing his complaint. See Doc. 11 at 1-2.

Accordingly, Sheppard has failed to show that the Court made a clear error in its previous Order and Judgment (Docs. 11; 12) and his motion for reconsideration (Doc. 13) is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 29th day of May, 2024.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell  
MARC T. TREADWELL, CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT